

Concordia University

Faculty of Fine Arts Council

Minutes of the Meeting of April 28, 2000

Present: C. Jackson (Chair), D. Berthiaume (for J. Cezar), M. Corwin, A. Fairchild, N. Helms, C. Hirst, H. Johnson, W. Krol, B. Layne, L. Lerner, J. Locke, E. Mongerson, M. Montanaro, K. O'Brien, S. Paikowsky, D. Pariser, K. Perry, P. Regimbald, M. Reinhart, P. Rist, D. Vivian

Absent with apologies:

G. Amantea, S. Anastasiu, L. Blair, M. Bromley, M. Bush, R. Ellias, J. Fowler, K. Griffin, R. Hale, T. Johns, K. Langshaw, C. Leslie, L. Peterson, L. Sharman, R. Tyrell

Guests: E. Abitbol, K. Adams, J.-P. Duchesne, H. Fischer, G. Gibbons, C. Kolak-Dudek, D. Terry

1. Appointments to the FPTC Elections Committee

The following appointments to the FPTC Elections Committee were approved by Council:

Sandra Paikowsky, Art History
Mario Falsetto, Mel Hoppenheim School of Cinema
Danica Jojich, Studio Arts

2. Agenda

The agenda was approved.

3. Minutes of the meeting of March 17, 2000

MOTION: (Corwin, Montanaro)

"that the minutes of the meeting of March 17, 2000 be approved with the following amendment:

- Under item 7, under Department of Art Education, the 1st sentence was corrected to read, "... students in specialization programmes must complete the practicum component teaching school-age children, not pre-school children."

CARRIED

4. Business Arising

There was no business arising from the Minutes.

5. Chair's Remarks

The Dean reported on the latest developments regarding the new government funding formula for universities. After an initial analysis it has become clear that the formula is damaging for Fine Arts due to a negative adjustment in the weightings for each student in the "arts" category. He explained that the government grant per student was calculated according to disciplinary sectors which were given various weightings which correspond to the estimated instructional costs. In the new formula the "arts" sector was moved to the lowest weight, thus creating a large shortfall between the expenses of the Faculty and the revenues it generates.

The University has formally requested the government re-consider this decision and we are awaiting their reply.

The Dean also remarked on the discussions at the previous Senate meeting over Fine Arts' budget deficit. In response to the questions he once again stressed the Faculty's intention of balancing its budget and producing a business plan which will provide solutions to the ongoing shortfall.

C. Jackson announced that applications and enrollments were up again this year.

C. Jackson announced the passing of a founding member of the Faculty of Fine Arts, Edwy Cooke. There will be a memorial gathering on Tuesday, May 2, 2000 at 2 p.m. in the De Sève Cinema.

6. Question Period

There were no questions at this time.

7. Media Lab Proposal

C. Jackson welcomed Mr. Hervé Fischer to the meeting, who had been invited to give an update on the Media Lab proposal that he has been working on.

H. Fischer thanked Council for the opportunity to discuss the Media Lab proposal. He emphasized that the Daniel Langlois Chair is unique, as it does not belong to a specific department, but to the Faculty as a whole. The Media Lab he proposes is devoted to technology and new content, emphasizing both artistic skills and creativity. He has had the opportunity to meet many individuals in the Faculty, but a constant exchange of information is required in order for him to establish needs and resource implications relating to the new Media Lab.

To begin his project, H. Fischer has asked J. Cezar to prepare an inventory of all the digital equipment available in the computer labs, outlining the frequency of their use per hour, by whom, etc. He encouraged all unit heads to provide J. Cezar with updated information on their equipment in order for needs to be prioritized accordingly.

H. Fischer explained that an electronic culture is developing, and that, in the future, artistic creation with new technology will be useful in any industry - be it, filmmaking, design for the theatre, music, etc. The Internet is not only an information tool, but also one for multimedia content. The Fine Arts will play a very important role in this market.

As has been done on a several occasions, H. Fischer suggested that the Faculty have another Symposium on Technology to exchange information on technological issues. He has many projects in mind for the Faculty including new labs, workshops, and new Chairs. The Faculty of Fine Arts needs new facilities to allow for the development of research, training and teaching.

He welcomes suggestions and input from anyone on these issues and will be meeting with members of each department to specifically discuss the Media Lab project.

Discussion:

L. Lerner asked H. Fischer if he needs a working committee to assist him with the Media Lab Project. He replied that he did. She assured him that she would assign a knowledgeable representative from the Department of Art History for the visual aspect, but also for the content.

W. Krol questioned the whole momentum of digital technologies which may be influencing students' way of thinking. That is, what is happening to the structure that presently exists and are we moving away from personal, hands-on activity? He fears that the value of traditional arts seems to be eroding. H. Fischer replied that he is a painter himself and can appreciate W. Krol's concerns. He pointed out that 90% of the Faculty of Fine Arts activities are devoted to artistic practices that are not digitally based. Technology is simply a tool and that without real, traditional artists, nothing can be put into "digital". H. Fischer intends to invite students to the next Technology symposium.

While S. Paikowsky understands that new technologies have and will become a tool for many artists, she expressed her concern that the proper resources would not be available to departments. There has to be basic funding built into the department and Faculty budgets for technicians, students to work on web sites, etc. She asked how this will be dealt with? C. Jackson replied that this is the central problem and there is a lot of activity around these issues. He is hoping that funding will be provided for the digital technologies projects. He quoted D. Langlois by saying that none of this is any good unless we have people as artists working in their usual way. This is the discussion and debate required to arrive at a common understanding of the new developments.

C. Jackson thanked H. Fischer for attending the meeting. H. Fischer encouraged Council members to communicate with him via email at hfischer@vax2.concordia.ca, or by telephone at 4672.

8. Strategic Planning and Budget Committee update (G. Gibbons)

C. Jackson welcomed G. Gibbons to the Council meeting for an update on the recent activities of the SPBC.

G. Gibbons reported that much of the SPBC's work has revolved around how the Faculty of Fine Arts can sustain and prove that it is indeed the best art school in Canada and perhaps in North America. The SPBC is not able to make any recommendations until the Government funding formulas and the University budget is clarified. As a result, today's report of activities is very brief.

The SPBC has asked all Departments for input and there are a couple of submissions yet to come. G. Gibbons has distributed a brief report that contains two sections. One section addresses the overarching themes and how the Faculty can maintain a degree of excellence in our programs. The SPBC intends to measure the Faculty's performance in programs and identify those that are excellent and can serve as a standard by which others can be measured. This will fit with what the

Government is proposing as performance indicators within the "contrat de performance". As the Government comes forward with what they view as excellence in the University, we will be able to find many things in common with the Faculty's own objectives. In the fall, the SPBC intends to present a set of objectives to Council for approval. Once a plan has been adopted, the Departments will be asked to help find the means for meeting those objectives.

G. Gibbons continued to explain that the other section discusses the Faculty's need for a Business Plan. The Faculty has been over budget for the past 4-5 years and will not be permitted to be in that situation in the future. The SPBC will be examining the Faculty's financial situation and will propose a few scenarios for balancing the budget.

The SPBC will continue to meet and its members are willing to attend departmental meetings. G. Gibbons will report further on the SPBC's activities at the mid-June SCAPP meeting and will provide Council with further information as it becomes available.

L. Lerner asked if the input provided by the Department of Art History will be used at some point in the planning process. She also asked what the SPBC's timeline is for completion of the strategic plan. G. Gibbons answered that Dr. Lightstone is not expecting to see the Faculty plans until October of this year. He added that the SPBC is waiting for all Departments to submit their input then all documentation and information will be considered for the preparation of the strategic plan.

D. Pariser questioned what the implications are if the Faculty does not meet its budget. G. Gibbons replied that that this is no longer an option; the University will no longer tolerate budget overages in Fine Arts.

H. Johnson asked if it will still possible to offer quality education, with low student/teacher ratios, and meet our budget. G. Gibbons is convinced that the Faculty's budget can be structured to do that. With the Government's currently proposed formula for funding universities, the Faculty is not in very good shape. However, the University administration is working hard to convince the Government to revise its funding formula which would bring us back to the status quo at least.

P. Rist reported that at the last Senate meeting he asked about the relationship between the actual cost of education and the funding formulas from the Government. He was told that no one has ever really looked at the cost of education per student in individual disciplines. For information, P. Rist pointed out that in Poland, Medicine and Cinema are the most expensive disciplines. In Quebec, there will probably never be that realistic a review and we will have no choice but to work with what the Government gives us.

L. Lerner cautioned the SPBC to carefully investigate the consequences of actions taken at other Universities, before embarking on any new initiatives. For example, as part of their planning process, York is trying to create a fast-track MFA within a short summer period on a cost-recovery basis, costing about \$15,000. per student, with approximately 15-20 students willing to do it. However, there is resistance from the students because they feel that Fine Arts should not be entering into a cost-recovery process. When making comparisons, a competitive edge must also to be considered.

C. Jackson thanked G. Gibbons for his report on the SPBC activities.

9. Undergraduate Curriculum Report # 65 (FFAC-00-04-28-D1)

C. Jackson asked A. Fairchild to present the curriculum changes proposed as contained in Undergraduate Curriculum Report # 65 (FFAC-00-04-28-D1).

Mel Hoppenheim School of Cinema

A. Fairchild summarized that the curriculum changes for the Mel Hoppenheim School of Cinema represent a fundamental change in the professional milieu, that is the replacement of traditional technology of films to digital technology (video). It has been deemed an absolute necessity for the department to phase in post-production and sound digital technologies for all undergraduate students by January 2003. All courses are becoming "digital", including writing of scripts on the computer. In the near future, the equipment for post-production analog facilities will no longer be available. The magnetic film sound equipment is vanishing and it has become a necessity to make these changes. All other changes reflect changes in descriptions. The resource implications for Cinema are substantial, however, funding should be forthcoming from the MEQ through the "programme réamenagé".

P. Rist added that the Mel Hoppenheim School of Cinema has been working on these changes for some time. In the end, if the Department is not given the funding for the equipment required to educate the 60 students per year in Film Production, then the number of students will have to be reduced. Throughout the curriculum document, statements in bold type are strategically placed for submissions to the Government. In response to W.Krol's earlier comments with respect to traditional art, P. Rist commented that that's how Concordia acquires its students - students want to work in Film rather than in video. The Faculty must go digital because of the changing milieu, but we will be the last place to actually give up working in celluloid (60 mm film) and it will be sustained as an art form.

D. Terry pointed out that the actual curriculum changes are minimal. The following courses have been added: FMPR 339, FMPR 338, FMPR 340, and mandatory laboratory sessions in Montage I. FMPR 242 and FMPR 342 have been deleted. Only two extra sections of Montage were added for next year, and descriptive changes were made.

A. Fairchild added that the curriculum changes must be made in a timely fashion and approved at all levels (Council, APC and Senate) before it can be eligible for submission to the Government program for funding. It will also be included on the list of new technologies programmes along with Design, Digital Image and Sound, and Animation.

M. Corwin expressed his concern about the Sound recording studios referred to in the document. The Department of Music has given up almost half of its capital budget to help other units acquire digital equipment. On the other hand Music has managed to function with an extremely limited budget for all of its equipment purchases and was the first department to upgrade to digital equipment with its existing capital. It appears that the Sound I course that will be offered by Cinema seems to be the same as Electroacoustics offered in Music. He asked for an explanation.

P. Rist clarified that the Sound equipment is already there and was acquired with the Mel Hoppenheim grant given especially for equipment purchases. D. Terry explained that Sound I is exclusively sound for film and the recording of voices for film. The Sound I course description will be modified to add "for film". Film Production students will be the only students permitted into this course.

Department of Studio Arts

C. Kolak Dudek summarized the proposed curriculum changes for the areas of Printmaking and Photography which are also related to digital technology. Print Media has deleted courses PRIN 241 and 361, and has added PRIN 341, 441, and 351. The added courses feature digital processes in print media. The Photography area has made two special topics courses into required courses and they have added a 3-credit Professional Internship course to enable students to work in a professional milieu. There are no resource implications for the above-noted changes.

MOTION: (A. Fairchild, L. Lerner)

“that the proposed curriculum changes presented in Undergraduate Curriculum Report # 65 be approved.”

CARRIED

10. General Education Requirement

A. Fairchild reported that the University Senate has approved the establishment of a general education requirement which will be applied to all students newly accepted into programs for September 2001. The distribution plan is to be specified by each Faculty. A small working group was formed in the Faculty of Fine Arts and has met a couple of times to discuss the implications of the implementation of a general education requirement. Generally, the Faculty of Fine Arts already requires students to take 12 credits outside the Faculty. It is expected that courses offered for general education purposes should bring in substantial FTE revenues.

S. Paikowsky asked for clarification as to what this is all about. She asked, is it about what our students do outside the Faculty, or what students can take in Fine Arts. A. Fairchild responded that our students already take 12 credits outside, but we need to officially approve a General Education Requirement and establish a plan on how we will accommodate students from outside the Faculty.

L. Lerner asked what effect the General Education Requirement will have on students taking courses in Minors and Majors in History, Geography and Anthropology. A. Fairchild responded that how they will do that remains to be clarified. The Faculty of Arts and Science is still working on developing clusters of courses which students will be able to take in the Arts or Science. L. Lerner added that if the Faculty of Arts and Science is working on clusters of courses to be taken from the Arts or Science: may overlap with the expertise of the Faculty of Fine Arts. She asked whether there will be another committee set up to examine all of the potential implications for the Faculty.

S. Paikowsky pointed out that as soon as a course is specified for the General Education Requirement, there will be resource implications. She asked if there was any way of tracking the number of students who will be taking these courses as part of the General Education Requirement versus those taking the course as an elective. J.-P. Duchesne answered that there is no mechanism for tracking the number of students who will register for these courses, especially since we do not know what Arts and Science will be putting forward. The distribution of the courses will either be as specified in the attached document, or some other distribution proposed by Faculties. J.-P. Duchesne does not see why Fine Arts should vote on this document until we develop our own

version.

As A. Fairchild mentioned, the Faculty of Arts and Science will be developing clusters of courses suitable to them. L. Lerner feels the Faculty of Fine Arts needs to be cautious with this entire issue. For example, the Liberal Arts College offers many Art History courses. The Faculty must be prudent if Arts and Science plans to create clusters of courses, with some Fine Arts courses, to meet the General Education Requirement. She does not wish to see Arts and Science coming up with Art History courses.

P. Rist said that what Fine Arts needs to do is meet status quo, that is, 12 credits outside the Faculty. We don't want to say students have to take 6 in one sector and 6 in another

J. Locke referred to the last page of the document which clearly shows that Arts and Science intends to set up their own version of a General Education Requirement so that their students can take all of the required courses within their Faculty. Courses seem to have been deliberately left out, such as Communication Studies, French language. This could mean that Fine Arts students who fulfill their 12 credits outside the Faculty of Fine Arts may need to take another 12 credits outside of Fine Arts in order to graduate. J. Locke feels we could approve the General Education Requirement without agreeing to comply with what is being presented in this document, but with the expectation that Fine Arts will do as Arts and Science and generate its own list which meets the distribution requirements.

M. Corwin pointed out that this document is talking about disciplinary sectors and not Faculties. This could mean that if students are in Arts and Science, they could take courses in a different sector within Arts and Science. For Fine Arts, this could mean that we could allow students in Music to take courses in Film to meet the requirements of GE.

A. Fairchild reported that this document was passed a long time ago. She doesn't think the disciplinary sectors are negotiable, but whatever Arts and Science will propose is sure to upset the bounds of the sectors. At a recent SCAPP meeting, she inquired about how the clusters will work and was told that the clusters are merely suggestions to students who will be free to make their own choices from the list that will be made available. The list of courses will be generated by the Registrar's Office and students will be required to take 12 credits outside their own Faculties.

E. Mongerson suggested that Council accept this provided that Fine Arts students can take any Arts and Science courses, even those not listed in one of these sectors.

J.-P. Duchesne emphasized that this document should not be accepted on the basis of lack of clarity. He added that he believes that the sectors are negotiable. The Registrar herself had not even seen this document until recently at a Faculty and Registrar Operations Committee and she believes it can be totally interpreted by any Faculty before its implementation. It has repercussions other than just taking 12 credits outside Fine Arts. For example, if one of our students has a Major in Design and a Minor in Art History, it reduces their credits outside to 6, which is against the existing Fine Arts rule. This clearly needs to be discussed and clarified.

C. Jackson recalled that when this was first discussed at Council, the Faculty of Arts and Science had rejected this policy. Fine Arts was not prepared to approve the document at that time either and therefore joined the Faculty of Arts and Science by rejecting to approve it.

M. Corwin raised a question about students wanting to do a Minor. Does the General Education Requirement imply that students will have to do a Minor and an additional 6 credits, in addition to

completing 66 credits in their area of study? Students would not want to do that.

P. Regimbald added that if the Faculty is able to generate a well-prepared list of courses for this requirement desirable to students, the Faculty can reap many benefits.

L. Lerner pointed out that Art History has about 20 courses with no prerequisites, therefore, Art History is already offering courses available to students outside the Faculty.

The General Education requirement (US-99-1-D2) was put to a vote. Due to the confusion and lack of clarity on the issue, Council rejected the proposal. There were two (2) abstentions.

11. Other

B. Layne gave an update on the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC). She reported that all Faculties have implemented a policy of review of projects involving human subjects. This process was instituted last year, but the Department of Studio Arts had rejected it. Rejecting such a policy can affect the funding the University receives from the SSHRC, NSERC and MRC. The Faculty HREC will negotiate with the Department of Studio Arts to come to a resolution.

L. Lerner announced the upcoming conference entitled, *Evocations of the Holocaust in Contemporary Canadian Arts Conference*. The conference will discuss the impact of the Holocaust in recent Canadian art, architecture, film, theatre, music and literature. All are welcome to attend.

The meeting was adjourned at Noon.

Submitted by:
Lynda Hyette
Executive Secretary to the Dean
June 22, 2000